

REMARKS

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner and his Supervisor for the courtesy of an interview granted to applicant's representatives Marc A. Berger (Reg. No. 44,029) and Marc A. Sockol (Reg. No. 40,823). The interview was held by telephone on Wednesday, November 3, 2004. Applicant has amended the claim language as discussed with the Examiner during the interview.

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance and is believed to overcome all of the objections and rejections made by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 19 and 20 to more properly claim the present invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 - 28 are presented for examination.

In Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5 - 8, 10, 14 - 17 and 19 - 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranganathan, U.S. Patent No. 5,754,170 ("Ranganathan") in view of Mast, U.S. Patent No. 5,881,287 ("Mast").

In Paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 2 - 4 and 11 - 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranganathan in view of Mast and further in view of Spilo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,298,422 ("Spilo").

In Paragraph 6 of the Office Action, Claims 9 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranganathan in view of Mast and further in view of Sugiyama et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,289,137 ("Sugiyama").

In Paragraphs 4 and 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner, citing Ranganathan, col. 11, lines 53 - 57 and claim 9, indicates that Ranganathan teaches modification of a display screen prior to display of a window. Applicant respectfully submits that Ranganathan describes manipulation of pixel data, but not modification of a screen pixel data, as recited in claim 1 of the subject application. Specifically, with respect to Ranganathan, screen pixel data corresponds to the data written in graphics memory element 56 of FIG. 4, and such data is not modified in Ranganathan in response to a window display event. Instead, Ranganathan uses a pixel mux 32 to select either graphics pixel data or movie overlay data. (Ranganathan / col. 6, lines 22 - 25) That is, instead of

modifying the graphics pixel data in response to movie data being displayed, Ranganathan merges two pixel streams; namely, the graphics pixel data and the movie overlay data. Applicant notes that the two streams in FIG. 4, one coming from the CRT FIFO element 58, and one coming from the MOVIE FIFO 30, are individual pixel streams, and not entire screen frames.

Also, in Paragraphs 4 and 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner, citing Mast, col. 3, lines 25 – 36 and lines 40 – 49, col. 10, line 66 – col. 11, line 1 and FIG. 8, indicates that Mast also teaches modification of a display screen prior to display of a window. Applicant respectfully submits that Mast modifies pixel data that is copied from a video display memory, but does not modify the pixel data within the video display memory itself. Indeed, the screen pixel data itself is not modified, as described in detail in Mast, col. 9, line 31 – col. 10, line 52, and illustrated in steps 603 – 613 in FIG. 6. Similarly, the modified pixel data in destination 800C of FIG. 8 corresponds to a destination image, and not the display image 800A, as described in Mast at col. 10, line 53 – col. 11, line 5.

Further, in Paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that “*preventing the window from absorbing copy protected image data into its background, in case the window is defined so as to have a transparent background*”, is not recited in the rejected claims. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, 19 and 20 correspondingly.

The rejections of claims 1 - 28 in paragraphs 1 - 5 of the Office Action will now be dealt with specifically.

As to amended independent method claim 1, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 1 of:

“modifying the graphics display frame buffer’s screen pixel data by replacing at least the portion of the screen pixel data that is going to be covered by the window with substitute pixel data, prior to the window being displayed”;

“displaying the modified screen pixel data”; and

“displaying the window over at least a portion of the substitute pixel data, thereby preventing the window from absorbing unmodified screen pixel data into its background, in case the window is defined so as to have a transparent background”

are neither shown nor suggested in Ranganathan, Mast, Spilo or Sugiyama, taken individually or in combination; as explained hereinabove.

Because claims 2 – 9, 21 and 22 depend from claim 1 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 – 9, 21

and 22 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Ranganathan, Mast, Spilo, Sugiyama, or a combination of Ranganathan, Mast, Spilo and Sugiyama.

Accordingly claims 1 – 9, 21 and 22 are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent system claim 10 applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 10 of:

“a pixel processor for modifying the graphics display frame buffer’s screen pixel data by replacing at least the portion of the screen pixel data that is going to be covered by the window with substitute pixel data, prior to the window being displayed”; and

“a display processor for displaying the screen pixel data and the modified screen pixel data, and for displaying the window over at least a portion of the substitute pixel data, thereby preventing the window from absorbing unmodified screen pixel data into its background, in case the window is defined so as to have a transparent background”

are neither shown nor suggested in Ranganathan, Mast, Spilo or Sugiyama, taken individually or in combination.

Because claims 11 – 18, 23 and 24 depend from claim 10 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 11 – 18, 23 and 24 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Ranganathan, Mast, Spilo, Sugiyama, or a combination of Ranganathan, Mast, Spilo and Sugiyama.

Accordingly claims 10 – 18, 23 and 24 are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent method claim 19 applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 19 of:

“modifying the graphics display frame buffer’s screen pixel data by replacing at least the portion of the screen pixel data wherein the proprietary digital image is going to be covered by the window with substitute pixel data, prior to the window being displayed”;

“displaying the modified screen pixel data”; and

“displaying the window over at least a portion of the substitute pixel data, thereby preventing the window from absorbing the proprietary digital image into its background, in case the window is defined so as to have a transparent background”

are neither shown nor suggested in Ranganathan, Mast, Spilo or Sugiyama, taken individually or in combination.

Because claims 25 and 26 depend from claim 19 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 25 and 26 are not

anticipated or rendered obvious by Ranganathan, Mast, Spilo, Sugiyama, or a combination of Ranganathan, Mast, Spilo and Sugiyama.

Accordingly claims 19, 25 and 26 are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent system claim 20 applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 20 of:

“a pixel processor for modifying the graphics display frame buffer’s screen pixel data by replacing at least the portion of the screen pixel data wherein the proprietary digital image is going to be covered by the window with substitute pixel data, prior to the window being displayed”; and

“a display processor for displaying the screen pixel data and the modified screen pixel data, and for displaying the window over at least a portion of the substitute pixel data, thereby preventing the window from absorbing the proprietary digital image into its background, in case the window is defined so as to have a transparent background”

are neither shown nor suggested in Ranganathan, Mast, Spilo or Sugiyama, taken individually or in combination.

Because claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 20 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 27 and 28 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Ranganathan, Mast, Spilo, Sugiyama, or a combination of Ranganathan, Mast, Spilo and Sugiyama

Accordingly claims 20, 27 and 28 are deemed to be allowable.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Dated: Nov 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By: M. A. Sockol

Marc A. Sockol
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,823

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone (650) 856-6500
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on

Date: Nov. 3, 2004

By: Cathi Thoorsell
Cathi Thoorsell